

Amendment Dated May 9, 2005
Response to Office Action Dated 02/11/05

Application No. 10/009,577
Attorney Docket No. 015222.000177

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 are pending. Claims 1-19 are rejected.

The Applicant filed a Preliminary Amendment on October 28, 2002 requesting that the title be amended to "CREATING COLLABORATIVE APPLICATION SHARING."

Specification

The abstract is objected to because an abstract is not on a separate sheet. The Applicant is attaching the abstract on a separate sheet. No new subject matter has been added.

Double Patenting

Claims 1-19 are rejected by the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. 101 allegedly because they are identical as cited corresponding claims 1-19 of U.S. Patent No. 6,611,822. The Applicant has amended claim 1 to include the additional features of "establishing interaction parameters for the plurality of users based on a destination of the collaborative training session" and "establishing the network connection mode between the plurality of users in accordance with the interaction parameters." The alleged corresponding claim (claim 1) of U.S. Patent No. 6,611,822 does not include neither feature. Similarly, the Applicant has amended claim 10 to include the features of "logic that establishes interaction parameters for the plurality of users based on a destination of the collaborative training session" and "logic that establishes the network connection mode between the plurality of users in accordance with the interaction parameters." The alleged corresponding claim (claim 10) of U.S. Patent No. 6,611,822 does not include neither feature. Also, the Applicant has amended claim 11 to include the features of "a code segment that establishes interaction parameters for the plurality of users based on a destination of the collaborative training session" and "a code segment that establishes the network connection mode between the plurality of users in accordance with the interaction parameters." The alleged corresponding claim (claim 11) of U.S. Patent No. 6,611,822 does not include neither feature. Moreover, claims 2-9 and 12-19 depend from claims 1 and 11 and contain different statutory subject matter than the corresponding claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,611,822. Thus, the Applicant requests reconsideration of claims 1-19.

Amendment Dated May 9, 2005
Response to Office Action Dated 02/11/05

Application No. 10/009,577
Attorney Docket No. 015222.000177

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-19 are rejected by the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,727,950 (Cook). Regarding claim 1, the Applicant has amended claim 1 to include the features of “establishing interaction parameters for the plurality of users based on a destination of the collaborative training session” and “establishing the network connection mode between the plurality of users in accordance with the interaction parameters.” The amendment is supported by the specification as originally filed. For example, Figure 97 (as discussed from page 221, line 11 – page 222, line 28) shows collaborate function 97070 (corresponding to meeting room function 97050) and collaborate function 97150 (corresponding to library function 97160). Corresponding to collaborate function 97070, a user can establish interaction parameters associated with record meeting function (97080) and list of attendees function (97090). Corresponding to collaborate function 97150, a user can establish interaction parameters for artifacts functions (97100-97130) and list of people function (97140). Cook does not provide any suggestions that even relate to interaction parameters based on a destination of the collaborative training session. Thus, Cook does not teach the above features and does not anticipate claim 1.

Similarly, the Applicant has amended claim 10 to include “logic that establishes interaction parameters for the plurality of users based on a destination of the collaborative training session” and “logic that establishes the network connection mode between the plurality of users in accordance with the interaction parameters.” Also, claim 11 has been amended to include “a code segment that establishes interaction parameters for the plurality of users based on a destination of the collaborative training session” and “a code segment that establishes the network connection mode between the plurality of users in accordance with the interaction parameters.” Moreover, claims 2-9 and 12-19 ultimately depend from claims 1 and 10 and are not anticipated for at least the above reasons. The Applicant requests reconsideration of claims 1-19.

Amendment Dated May 9, 2005
Response to Office Action Dated 02/11/05

Application No. 10/009,577
Attorney Docket No. 015222.000177

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and
a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 9, 2005



Kenneth F. Smolik
Registration No. 44,344
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
10 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 3000
Chicago, IL 60606-7407
Telephone: 312-463-5000
Facsimile: 312-463-500

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ BLACK BORDERS
- ☐ IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- ☒ FADED TEXT OR DRAWING
- ☐ BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING
- ☐ SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- ☐ COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS
- ☐ GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS
- ☒ LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT
- ☐ REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY
- ☐ OTHER: _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.